UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA FORT MYERS DIVISION

VI	α	\mathbf{O}	D	$\mathbf{N}\mathbf{I}$	\mathbf{p}	17
V L	\cup 1	. U	Lι	TAT	.L\£	14.

TOI	•	. •	CC
PI	ain	11	1++
	am	U	ш.

v. Case No: 2:18-cv-254-SPC-NPM

I.C. SYSTEMS, INC.,

Defendant.

ORDER¹

Before the Court is United States Magistrate Judge Nicholas P. Mizell's Report and Recommendation ("R&R") (Doc. 110). Judge Mizell recommends granting in part Plaintiff's Motion for attorney's fees (Doc. 71). The R&R also indicates the Court should deny Plaintiff's Motions for judicial notice (Doc. 82) and sanctions (Doc. 96). Neither party timely objected, so the matter is ripe for review.

After conducting a careful and complete review of the findings and recommendations, a district judge "may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part," the magistrate judge's R&R. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). In the absence

¹ Disclaimer: Documents hyperlinked to CM/ECF are subject to PACER fees. By using hyperlinks, the Court does not endorse, recommend, approve, or guarantee any third parties or the services or products they provide, nor does it have any agreements with them. The Court is also not responsible for a hyperlink's availability and functionality, and a failed hyperlink does not affect this Order.

of specific objections, there is no requirement that a district judge review the R&R de novo. See Garvey v. Vaughn, 993 F.2d 776, 779 n.9 (11th Cir. 1993). Instead, when parties don't object, a district court need only correct plain error as demanded by the interests of justice. See, e.g., Symonette v. V.A. Leasing Corp., 648 F. App'x 787, 790 (11th Cir. 2016); Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 150-52 (1985). Plain error exists if (1) "an error occurred"; (2) "the error was plain"; (3) "it affected substantial rights"; and (4) "not correcting the error would seriously affect the fairness of the judicial proceedings." Farley v. Nationwide Mut. Ins., 197 F.3d 1322, 1329 (11th Cir. 1999).

After careful consideration and an independent review of the case, the Court finds no plain error. So it accepts and adopts the well-reasoned R&R (Doc. 110) in full.

Accordingly, it is now

ORDERED:

- The Report and Recommendation (Doc. 110) is ACCEPTED and ADOPTED and incorporated into this Order.
- Plaintiff's Motion for Sanctions Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1927 (Doc. 96) is DENIED.
- 3. Plaintiff's Request for Judicial Notice (Doc. 82) is **DENIED**.
- 4. Plaintiff's Renewed Motion for Costs and Attorneys' Fees (Doc. 71) is GRANTED and DENIED in part.

- a. Plaintiff is **AWARDED** \$72,651.50 in attorney's fees.
- b. Plaintiff is **AWARDED** \$1,366.79 in costs.
- c. Plaintiff's fees and costs award **BEARS** post-judgment interest (under 28 U.S.C. § 1961(a)) from September 5, 2019, until paid.
- 5. The Clerk is **DIRECTED** to enter judgment for Plaintiff and against Defendant of \$72,651.50 in attorney's fees and \$1,366.79 in costs, both bearing post-judgment interest from September 5, 2019, until paid.

DONE and **ORDERED** in Fort Myers, Florida on September 8, 2021.

SHERI POLSTER CHAPPELL
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Copies: All Parties of Record